REMARKS

In this response, claims 11-21 and 31-40 have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, the ¶103 rejections of these claims are moot.

Regarding the remaining claims, claim 1 stands rejected as being obvious over Hayashi in view of Adams and in further view of Dowling. Claim 1 is directed to a mobile communications device that activates and deactivates a complementary multi-media effect in time with the playback of an audio file. To accomplish this, the mobile communications device comprises a processor that analyzes the audio contents of the audio file, and then calculates synchronizing information based on that analysis. The processor then uses the calculated synchronizing information to generate a pattern in which to activate/deactivate the complementary multi-media effect synchronously with the playback of the audio. *E.g. Spec.*, p. 6, ln. 3 – p. 7, ln. 11.

The Office Action acknowledges that neither Hayashi nor Adams, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a mobile communications device comprising, "a processor configured to…generate a pattern in which to render a complementary multi-media effect synchronously with the playback of the audio file based on … calculated synchronizing information." For this, the Office Action cites Dowling.

Dowling discloses a method for synchronizing lighting systems to an audio file, but does not teach or suggest a *processor that generates a synchronizing pattern based on synchronizing information that it calculated*, as claimed. Rather, Dowling explicitly teaches that an operator manually authors a lighting program to control the activation/de-activation of the lighting. The authored program is ***not*** based on synchronizing information calculated by a mobile communications device processor, but rather, comprises one or more "stock" effects selected by a user from a pre-defined list of stock effects. E.g., *Dowling*, ¶[0036-0041].

The explicit user-interaction that is necessarily required for manually generating and controlling lighting sequences in Dowling is not the same as a mobile communications device

processor generating a synchronization pattern for one or more complementary multi-media effects based on calculations performed from an analysis of an audio file by the processor. They are wholly separate concepts and one does not teach or suggest the other. Because none of the references teaches or suggests the claimed processor function, their combination necessarily fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 1. As such, claim 1 and its dependent claims are non-obvious over the cited references, alone and in combination.

The Office Action also indicates that independent claims 22, 41, and 57 as being obvious over Hayashi in view of Adams. Claim 22 is directed to a method of synchronizing multi-media effects with an audio file in a mobile communications device. Claim 41 is a method claim directed to synchronizing one or more complementary multi-media effects with an audio file in a mobile communications device. Claim 57 is an apparatus claim directed to a microprocessor in the mobile communications device configured to synchronize complementary multi-media effects with an audio file in a mobile communications device. Each of these claims contains language similar to that of claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those stated above, none of the references teaches or suggests, alone or in combination, any of claims 22, 41, and 57, or any of their respective dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and thus, respectfully requests the allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.

Dated: May 5, 2009

Stephen A. Herrera
Registration No.: 47,642
Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084